



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,333	03/28/2001	Pavitra Subramaniam	005306.P026	3135

7590 03/15/2004

Dennis M. de Guzman
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2004

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/820,333

Applicant(s)

SUBRAMANIAM ET AL.

Examiner

Mylinh T Tran

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received..

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-11, 14-15 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sarkar [US. 6,012,067].

As to claims 1, 11 and 15, Sarkar discloses loading a definition associated with a logical structure (relational database, column 5, lines 37-47); associating components of the logical structure to an intermediate unit (tables, column 8, lines 58-65 and column 9, lines 32-35); based at least in part on the loaded definition, executing the logical structure to determine a presentation sequence (Figure 3, tables R, S, T) of the components associated to the intermediate unit (column 9, lines 30-46); and generating a file, which represents the presentation sequence of a network to allow presentation of the component, to transmit across as part of a user interface on a client terminal (column 9, lines 9-14).

As to claim 2, Sarkar also discloses the logical structure is usable for a customer relationship management system (column 5, lines 14, 18).

As to claim 6, Sarkar teaches the intermediate unit comprising a logical entity having a virtual table, the virtual table capably associating portions of the loaded definition to a single structure (column 4, lines 3-10).

As to claim 7, Sarkar also teaches executing the logical structure to determine the presentation sequence of the components includes using a function call to read the loaded script definition (column 9, line 47 through column 10, line 6).

As to claim 8, Sarkar shows the generated file comprising a hypertext markup language (HTML) file (column 10, lines 46-55).

As to claims 10, 14 and 18, Sarkar also shows providing a first user interface component different from a second user interface component that generates the file to transmit across the network (column 5, lines 48-67, the first user interface (table) has different component than the second user interface (table)); and using an element of the first user interface component to interact with the intermediate component to present the sequence at the first user interface component or to allow other manipulation related to the executed logical structure (column 11, lines 42-57).

As to claim 19, Sarkar provides the storage location comprising a database, the database having tables from which the definition is loaded by the loader (column 3, lines 47-61).

As to claim 20, Sarkar also provides the storage location comprising a file system, the file system capable to store a definition file having the definition, the loader capable to load the definition file stored in the file system (column 4, lines 57-63).

As to claim 21, Sarkar suggests the definition comprising a plurality of elements compiled into a single block of data stored in the storage location (column 3, lines 47-61, data in each table is stored into a single block).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-5, 9, 12-13 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarkar in view of Kingberg et al. [5,734,887].

As to claims 3, 4 and 12, the difference between Sarkar and the claim is question and answer tables. Although Sarkar shows relationship between two tables, it does not clearly show the relationship between question and answer tables. On the other hand, Kingberg et al. teaches the two tables at figures 7 and 8A, column 4, line 60 through column 5, line 8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sarkar and Kingberg et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify relational database taught by Sarkar to include the two specific relationship between question and answer tables of Kingberg et al., with the motivation being to satisfy a query structure as taught by Kingberg.

As to claim 5, Kingberg et al. also discloses the components of the logical structure including questions (column 7, lines 27-36).

As to claims 9, 13 and 17, Kingberg et al. teaches executing the logical structure to determine the presentation sequence of the components includes interacting with a set of rules at the intermediate unit to determine a number of components, including questions at branches of the logical structure, to present on the client terminal (column 16, lines 7-23).

As to claim 16, Kingberg et al. also teaches an answer table or database table linked to the execution unit to store answers received from the client terminal in response to the

Art Unit: 2174

presentation of the components, wherein presentation components of the logical structure is further based at least in part on the received answers (column 7, lines 27-36).

Conclusion

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a response, (703) 872-9306 for all kind of communications. NOTE, A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8.00AM to 6.30PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640,

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2174

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100